UNION PRESBYTERIAN SEMINARY
3 2146 00512 8288

UG
22.
Zp
N. 14
Box 9

The Ordinance

of

Baptism.

What Is It?

UG
22
Zp
Box 3
no. 1

THE LIBRARY
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Richmond, Virginia

By

Rev. Herbert H. Hawes, D. D.

Staunton, Va.

1889.

The Ordinance of Baptism.

WHAT IS IT?

We say: It is the application of *water to the person* in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.—Matt. xxviii, 19. By actions, Immersionists say: It is the application of the *person to the water*, etc.

Which is the right way? Immersionists decide by appealing to heathen Greeks and Lexicons, instead of to Jesus, the Lord of Christian baptism. Do they not always begin by saying "*Baptizo*, meaning dip, or immerse," or in some such way? They also expound wisely (?) about "*Rantizo*, Sprinkle, and *Cheo*, pour," as if those words have anything to do with the matter. *Our only business is with* BAPTIZE—for Jesus said, "Baptize." What did he mean in using that word? His followers have no other question before them!

But let us see what Greeks, etc., do say. *Pindar*, (Before Christ 520 years) the first writer known to use the word "*Baptizo*," used it of a fishing-net cork, on the water. *Plato*, (B. C., 429) used it of intoxication from *drinking* wine. (The wine was *put into the persons*, not they into the wine.) Again: of a youth confused by questions. *Aristotle* (B. C., 384) used it of rising tides. And it was used by many other persons in different senses. After Christ: *Jerome* (A.D. 321) used it as "pour." *Basil* (A. D. 310) said "pouring." *Cyprian* (A. D. 246-260) called "*affusion*" the baptism of the Church.

In the Acts of St. Lawrence, A. D. 250, we read of a a soldier baptized from a *pitcher of water*.

Tertullian (A. D. 145-210) used "*merse*" once, and "*sprinkle*" twice, in speaking of what was called, in his day, the baptism of the twelve Apostles.

Clemens Alexandrinus (born A. D. 105) says: "with tears, a second time he was baptized." And Dr. Broadus, (Baptist) of our day, finds it necessary to defend immersion *against Lexicons* which also give

"pour, drench," etc (Im. pp. 14, 15.) Only a few, out of many examples, are here given. They prove that *Baptizo* was used by different persons, in different senses—*No one will deny it who cares for the truth!* "*Baptizo*" was not used only as "dip, or immerse." It never could nor can be translated by any one English word; therefore Immersionists are wrong in saying "it means only dip, or immerse." How, then, can we decide duty? A great Immersion leader—Dr. Jeter—shall answer. Speaking (Scrip. Com. p 13) of baptism and the Lord's Supper, he said: "They derive their authority * * * *solely from the revealed will of the Lawgiver.* * * * *Both these institutions are precisely what the will of Christ made them.*"

Notice the words I have italicised. A leading Immersionist wrote them, yet no Immersionist will dare to stand to them! "No,"—their acts say—"Greeks and lexicons! Not the will of Jesus!" We say: "*The will and example of Jesus, only!*" And what is "the revealed will of the Lawgiver?" What "precisely," did "the will of Christ" make the act of baptism? *The Bible, not Lexicons, must say.* In Acts I, 5, He promised to baptize "with the Holy Ghost." In the next chapter that baptizing is described. So in Acts xi, 15—"The Holy Ghost fell on them." The "sound" of the descending baptism "filled all the house," but the symbol of the Holy Ghost's presence "sat upon each of them." They were not *immersed* in the Holy Ghost at all! So, when "the Lawgiver" applied *Baptizo* to one of His institutions, He used it in the sense of *descending upon.* That was His act, His *example.* That is "*precisely what the will of Christ*" made the act of baptizing! Therefore water —the symbol for our use—must be made to fall upon those we baptize. *No other act follows the example of Jesus!* No one has the right to change that form! It came from "the Lawgiver." But how about "into and out of the water?" The Greek only says: "To and from." Not a word in the English Bible puts one *under* water. I deliberately challenge the world to produce one case of *going under water* in baptism, from God's word! There is not a solitary instance! "But Rom. vi, and Col. ii, say, 'buried in baptism.'" That would drown you. To bury is to put under and *leave there.* But the Bible says no such thing. The saying is an Immersionist deception. The Bible says: "Buried with him (Jesus) by baptism into death;"—not "*like* him." nor "*into* water." "Buried *with*,"—

not *like*—"him, in baptism." "Planted"—not *like*, but "together" (with him) "in the likeness of his *death*"—not "*burial*." Read and see! *This* baptism makes us dead as to sin, and alive unto God. *It saves us.* Can water do that? No! Then this is not water baptism. What baptism saves us? The baptism with the Holy Spirit. His work makes us one with Christ in his atonement—puts us into Christ—*saves us!*

Then this is the Holy Spirit's work, which is spoken of as baptism.

"Planted?" That is not dipping in and taking out. Planting, like burial, *puts into and leaves there.* It is the permanent condition of being represented in Christ, by our union to Him in His atoning work. So mean Rom. vi, Col. ii. The Holy Spirit still baptizes. 1 Cor. xii, 13. We are baptized into Christ. Gal. iii, 27. "But John's baptizing?" Was not *Christian* baptism, else all Judea, etc., would have been Christ's followers, for John baptized all. Mark i, 5; Luke iii, 21. At the last, Jesus had but a small following in Jerusalem. Acts i, 15. "Much water at Enon?" *There was more in Jordan.* If John's object was "much water" he would not have left Jordan. John's baptism was a Jewish purifying rite. Jno. iii, 25.

Clean, running water was required by law, so he went to the springs—the *many streams* of Enon. And would not so large a multitude as attended his ministry require "much water" for drinking and other purposes? Paul (Acts xix) would not recognize John's as Christian baptism. *He rebaptized twelve men whom John had baptized.*

We hear much from Immersionists about "*concessions*" of Wesley, Calvin and others, in their favor. But:

1. Mere *statements* are not "concessions." A man may *state*, as done by others, what he does not accept or practice as right. So of Calvin, Wesley, etc.

2. All the "concessions" in the world do not amount to anything if opposed to the revealed will of Christ, "the Lawgiver."

But why deal with endless cavils? He who copies the act and example of Jesus will do right. I have shown "precisely" His will.

HERBERT H. HAWES,
Staunton, Va.

☞ This Card will be furnished at Ten Cents per Dozen, postage paid.